(SRI K. NAGAPPA ALVA)

(*d*) The pay and allowances drawn at the time of deputation are paid to them during the period of training from the Budget allotment of the Institution in which they were working.

SRI M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Law).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Notification No. LAW 10 COR 64, dated 21st January 1965 (Amendment to the Mysore Court Fees and Suits Valuation Rules 1950) as required under sub-section 3) of section 78 of the Mysore Court Fees and Suits Valuation Act, 1958.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Minister for Labour, Housing and Transport).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Account of the Mysore State Road Transport Corporations with the Audit Report thereon for the period from 1-8-1961 to 3-3-1962 (1961-62) as required under sub-section (4) of section 33 of the Road Transport Corporation Act, 1950 (Central Act LXIV of 1950).

Member's Representations

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ದೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ನಾನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಾದರೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಾಂದೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member will kindly tell me the number of the Questions. What can I do now? However, he may put it in writing and send it on to me.

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTION-

re : the Border disputes betwen Mysore and the adjoining States including Maharashtra.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As regards the further discussion on the Resolution, the position is like this. I think we have discussed this Resolution on 2-4-1964, 3-4-1964, 20-6-1964 and then on 27-6-1964, and the total time taken up was 7 hours 53 minutes. The last person to speak was Sri Gopala Gowda, who had not concluded his speech. The H n'ble Member is not present. So, it will be taken that he has concluded his speech.

SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—I want to speak on the Resolution, Sir.

SRI GANJI VEERAPPA (Haribar).—The Resolution has been discussed for over three days. The time allotted for the resolution has already been spent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The time allotted has been exhausted and it has to be extended now. The reply has to be given on behalf of the Government and then perhaps the mover has to reply and then it has to be put to the House.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Sir, today is the last day of the session. We cannot give notice to the Chair and take his permission to bring in other matters before the House. There is a Press Report that the Home Minister is enquiring into the photostat copies obtained by the Members of the Opposition. I want to know from the Hon'ble Home Minister whether the enquiry is being conducted against the Members of the Opposition who exhibited the photostat copies.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is there anything? The Hon'ble Member invites the attention of the Home Minister regarding enquiry. He likes to know whether it is against the Members of the Opposition.

Sri R. M PATIL (Miniter for Home).—It is an enquiry. At this stage, I cannot say anything. It may involve anybody. It is an enquiry. It is an enquiry in a comp ehensive way.

Mr. SPEAKER.—With regard to this resolution, what time shall we requre?

Sri. GANJI VEERAPPA.—Half-an-hour.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who replies on behalf of the Government?

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—Sir, the Hon'ble Chief Minister has to say something about this resolution. He has promised. But it appears that he is not present to day.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I believe that there was a message to me that the Hon'ble Chief Minister is slightly indisposed and that he is not able to come. He will not be able to attend today. Who replies on behalf of the Government? Is it the Hon'ble Finance Minister?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I am expecting a reply from the Chief Minister. In case the Chief Minister is not feeling well today, the consideration of the resolution may be adjourned to some other day.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It rests with the House.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Of course, it is a request to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER—I will do it. In the meanwhile, there is notice of an amendment to this resolution, moved on 2nd April 1964.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The amendment was printed and given. But the Hon'ble Mover was absent when it had to be moved.

Sri A. J. DODDAMETI.—I am told it has been moved. I will read from the copy of the proceedings of 2nd April 1964. Mr. A. J. Doddameti moved his amendment to the resolution—"in line 3 omit the words 'including Maharashtra', and in line 4 for the words "(*a*) linguistic majority, (*b*) Contiguity.....wishes of the people" substitute the words "Mutual agreement to be arrived at between the States concerned

(Sri A. J. Dodda Meti)

in the matter of effecting minor border adjustments wherever found necessary." The amendment has been moved.

Are there anybody who are disirous of participating in the debate further? First of all, I will have to ascertain what exactly we will be doing. Where is the Whip of the Party? What shall we do with regard to the reply? The Hon'ble Member Sri Patil states that on a prior occasion, an assurance was given that the Chief Minister himself will reply. For reasons beyond his control, due to indisposition, he is unable to do so. A suggestion is made that the whole thing might be adjourned to a later date. I will have to gather the sense of the House. Members will have to guide me. The House is supreme. There is nothing that the House cannot do, provided it is within the rules. What shall we do?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I will reply to the resolution, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members may kindly retire from the House and discuss it. On the last day, when the members go, they must go with a happy frame of mind.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It is an assurance given by the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore, I suggest both of them meet.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Several times, the Hon'ble Chief Minister has promised. Unfortunately, today, he is not well. So the matter requires to be adjourned. I am not expecting a reply from the Cabinet, but from the Chief Minister.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sri Sunthankar is willing to speak on this resolution. At ten O'clock we adjourn for Tea. In the meanwhile, we will get in touch and come to some decision.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I entirely agree subject to a little rider as to why this could not have been done earlier.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—This resolution is being discussed.....

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Time, Sir..... .....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Ten minutes. Anyhow the House rises for Tea at 10 A.M.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, this resolution is of vital importance to the people residing in the border areas on both sides of this State. This resolution is being discussed in the House for four or five days and Hon'ble Members on both sides have participated in the debate and expressed their views. I am very much thankful to the members who have supported this resolution. I may say that by supporting the resolution, the Hon'ble Members have served the real interests of Karnataka. I regret to say that those who have opposed

this resolution have not realised that they have opposed the merger of Kannada areas lying in the adjacent States which should as a matter of fact legitimately be included in the State of Mysore.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Sir, this resolution is a comprehensive resolution. This resolution encompases within its scope the border areas Kannada as well as Marathi on both sides of the State. This Resolution urges the Central Government that all the Kannada areas which are lying outside the State should be merged with Mysore State and all the Marathi areas in the State lying on the borders should be integrated with the State of Maharashtra, and that too on the basis well defined principles. Sir, the States Reorganisation Commission and the States Reorganisation Act also have left the work of the border areas unfinished. The work of readjustment of boundaries has been left unfinished and incomplete in the process of reorganisation. So, it has got to be completed. The process of reorganisation is not complete unless the clear demarcation of the boundaries is completed. Till then, this process of reorganisation will not be complete. Therefore, we have suggested in this resolution the method to finish the unfinished task.

Sir, the well defined and unidentifiable principles laid down in the Resolution are contiguity village as unit linguistic majority and wishes of the people. In the discussion that has taken place in this House, all sorts of irrelevant issues were brought in by our opponents and various motives were attributed to us Issues such as Balkanisation, Pakistan for every language, issue of Goa, Sagari State which have no bearing on the main question brought in and thrown against us. Similarly, we were dubbed as provincialists, narrow-minded, sectarian parochial and so forth. Sir, we were criticised that we were pressing our claim on the floor of this House so that we may get elected again, only for the sake of elections. We simply play to the electorate to show that we are placing the claim of the border areas. Sir, that has been a most uncharitable criticism that was levelled against us.

This criticism is not only doing injustice to us but injustice to the cause that we are representating to bring Kannadigas into Mysore who are now in other States, and who are unfortunately thrust in the adjoining States. Sir, what we say is that all the Kannada areas which are lying in the adjoining States should be integrated with Mysore and all the Marathi areas on the borders that were included in Mysore should be integrated with Maharashtra. That is our simple demand. We do not say that only Marathi areas should go to Maharashtra. We are pressing the claims of Kannadigas who are unfortunately left out of Mysore. Sir, is that provincialism to say that Kannada people in Madakasira, Talavadi firka, South Sholapur, Akkalkot, Jath, etc., should be included in Mysore ? Is it narrow-mindedness ? Is it Balkanisation or sectarian ? Sir, this is not the proper way of looking at things. Is it linguistic fanaticism ? We are pressing for a just and legitimate demand

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

of the Marathi people as well as Kannadigas. Sir, those who call us as provincialists, they themselves are provincialists because by forcing the Marathi areas to stay in the Mysore State permanently, they are revealing their own provincial attitude, they are revealing their own sectarianism and narrow-mindedness. They want to re ain what does not belong to them legitimately and they want it all at costs.

Sir, it is said that we are pressing our claim with our eye on the elections. But, pleople of our areas have been agitating for the last 8 to 10 years. They have undergone various hard-hips and privations. More than 16,000 people have courted arrest and gone to jail. They have faced firings and a number of people have lost their precious lives in the firings by the police. They have undergone all sorts of sufferings and hardships. Is this sufferi g and hardship and st uggle for the last ten years merely for a few seats in this House or elsewhere. That is not the proper way of looking at things. I wish to appeal to the Hon'ble Members of this House, particularly the Members on the opposite side, to consider our demand dispassionately. I would request them earnestly to have an open mind, to keep an open mind and consider this issue. I regret to say that our friends like Hon'ble Sri Doddameti, Hon'ble Sri Bheemanna and others reveal a close mind. They do not want the re-consideration of the issue. That is not the democratic way of looking at things and it does not keep with the democratic spirit. We should always have an open mind. In democracy, the whishs of the people, the demands of the people have got to be respected. What we ask is only justice and fairness; nothing else.

Sir, it has been argued again and again that States Reorganisation Commission and the Parliament have already finally decided this issue and this issue should not be reopened again. My Hon'ble. friend Sri Bheemanna pleaded that this issue should not be reopened. There is no basis for this argument. The Hon'ble Member Sri Bhimanna was pleased to say that Parliament has passed a decree. He compared the decision of the Parliament on the States Reorganisation Act as a decree. Decision of Parliament cannot be compared with a decree of the court. Parliament is not a law-court.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may continue after the recess. The House now will rise to meet after half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Ten of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Ten of the clock.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, this border question has been kept open by the Parliament as well as by the Central Government. It will be very clear from the proceedings of the Lok Sabha that this question has been kept open by the Parliament. I would like to refer to the speech in the Lok Sabha of the then Home Minister, the late Sri G. B. Pant, who had piloted the States Reorganisation Bill. While giving the eply to the debate on that Bill, he referred at length to the problem of border readjustments. He said at the time that the proposals for territorial adjustments exceeded 170. That means, there were as many as 170 proposals before the Lok Sabha for readjustment of boundaries. He also said: "Many of them are overlapping. It is obviously impossible for the House to examine those proposals on their merits. No House can deal with these matters of detail in a hurried way." Further he said: "Now, as Hon'ble Members are aware, the Zonal Councils have been authorised to deal with these boundary matters pertaining to readjustment of territories lying on the common borders of the States." So, he made it clear that the Lok Sabha cannot go into the details of all these boundary readjustments. So, that is why a machinery was created by the Parliament to deal with such problems and that machinery was the Zonal Councils. The work of readjustment of the boundaries was left to the Zonal Councils. Then, again, the late Home Minister Sri Pant, also stated clearly that this issue (the border adjustment) must be solved. He said: "I do not mean that they should be shelved; they must be solved." So, it is very clear from these statements of the late Sri G. B. Pant that this question of boundary readjustment was kept open by the Parliament. So, it is no use saying that that chapter has been closed and that it cannot be raked up again. This assurance of the late Home Minister was repeated thereafter many times by the responsible members of the Central Government. The Hon'ble Lal Bahadur Sastry, our Prime Minister, when he was the Home Minister repeated more than once the same assurance. Then, the present Home Minister, the Hon'ble Gulzarilal Nanda, has also repeated that assurance. He made it clear when he had come to Bangalore to discuss these matters that this question has been kept open by his predecessors and that this question came to him as a legacy which he should try his best to solve.

Then, Sir, so many things happened during the last years. This border question was never closed. There was the appointment of the Four-Man Border Committee with two representatives of the Mysore Government and two representatives of the Maharashtra Government and they submitted their reports, the Maharashtra representatives submitting their report and the Mysore representatives submitting their separate report.

Then, Sir, I must say with gratitude that the present Union Home Minister the Hon'ble Sri Gulzarilal Nandaji has taken up this question very seriously. He has had long discussions with the representatives of the Maharashtra Government, the Mysore Government and also the

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

representatives of the various border areas and after prolonged delebera-tions he has submitted his report. It is very clear from all these that the problem has been kept open and it has got to be solved. Our Hon'ble friend Bhimanna said that it was a decree. How can it be a decree ? In democracy, as our late revered leader and Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru used to say, there is no finality in democracy. There is noting final in democracy. In democracy questions and issues can be reconsidered, can be kept open, can be re-opened and then reconsidered. So, there is no finality in democracy as he used to say. Similarly, Parliament itself has amended so many times so many of its ACTS. Even the S. R. Act has undergone so many changes. It is said that the Report of the S. R. Commission was final, but has it been final? Even the S. R. Act has made so many changes in the recommendation. My friend Hon'ble Sri Doddameti raised the Fazal All Commission and particularly Sir Panikkar to the skies. He called Panikkar as Mahapurush. He called him Mahapurush because the report of the Fazal All Commission recommended that the Marathi areas of Belgaum, and Karwar should be included in Karnatak, but he conveniently forgot that the same report had given Bellary to Andhra. He conveniently forgot that the Kannada areas of Bidar were not included in Mysore. According to the recommendations of the S. R. Commission only Gulbarga and Raichur Districts of Hyderabad Karnatak were included in Mysore State and they had taken away the Kannad areas of Bidar District from the Mysore State and given them over to some other State. He conveniently forgot all that. Is he willing to accept that, let me ask him ? Is he willing to accept this recommendation of the S. R. Commission ? Was he prepared to part with Bellary ? To include Bellary in Andhra was he prepared or is he prepared to part with the Kannada areas of Bidar district ? Because the Commission gave Belgaum and Karwar to Mysore State, my friend called Panikkar as Mahapurush. This is a strange argument. It is strange logic. Similarly, the S. R. Act was amended so many times by Parliament itself. There was readjustment of Andhra and Madras borders and tha was passed by Parliament. Then there was bifurcation of the bilingual Bombay State. The bilingual Bombay State which was introduced by the S. R. Act was bifurcated and made into two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. So, Sir, so many times this S. R. Act was amended. Even our Constitution was amended by Parliament 17 times. From this it is very clear that nothing is final in democracy. Parliament can amend its own decisions.

Again, it is said that language is not the only criterion. That is the patent argument advanced against us. May I ask why was Karnatak formed ? Why was there this persistent and insistent demand for 40 to 50 years that all the Kannada areas should be integrated into one State ? What was the basis of Karnatak ? Language was the basis. The reorganisation of States took place on the basis of language. What

are the various States but linguistic States? They are all linguistic States. Linguistic homogenity was the most important argument put forth by the leaders of the Samyukta Karnatak movement. Why were they claiming Bellary? Why are they even now claiming Kasargode, Madaksira, South Sholapur, Akkalkot, Jath, etc.? They are claiming these areas only because of the consideration of language. If the criterion of language is not taken, then all the claims to Kasargode and other areas would be forfeited. Even the S. R. Commission Report says on page 100 that the Kannda speaking areas of South and North were brought together. So it is clear that languge has been the basis for reorganisation of States. The States Reorganisation Commission, the support of which is taken by our opponents, bungled in the issue of the borders of the States. They did not realise the seriousness and the gravity of this border problem. They took district as unit for demarcation of boundaries, but they did not stick to that even and they came down to taluk and even below to areas of taluks and the some portions. So, for, demarcation purposes they did dot take one unit. They took various units for various stages and for various places and on account of that Karnatak lost many of its border areas. They did not adopt a rational basis and rational principles to demarcate boundaries.

Then they introduced a minor element of barter in their recommendations. They said that as Bellary was given to Andhra according to their recommendations, the Karnatak people should be satisfied with that because they had given Belgaum to Karnatak. So that was a question of barter they introduced and they argued that the Karnatak people should remain satisfied with getting Belgaum as compensation for losing Bellary. That was the sort of vicious bargain they introduced. They played that kind of bargain by giving Bellary to Andhra and in return for that as compensation or remuneration giving Belgaum to Karnatak.

Sri A. J. DODDAMETI.—We have got back Bellary.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—That is why I say that on the basis on which Bellary was subsequently given back to Karnatak, on the same basis Belgaum must go to Maharashtra. This kind of barter made by the States Reorganisation Commission is bad. The lives of people and their territories cannot be bartered or exchanged in the manner proposed by the Commission. My Hon'ble friend, Mr. Doddameti, was pleased to admit that there are hardships on both sides, for the Marathi people living in Kannada areas and the Kannada people in Marathi areas. The people of Kasargode are also the worst sufferers. Here are the resolutions which were adopted by the Kasargode Karnataka Pranthikaran Samiti at a conference held on 6th May 1964. They have passed a number of resolutions protesting against the attitude of their State Government. They have expressed protests for the utter neglect and disregard shown towards their areas. They have ventilated their grievances through various resolutions, as many as 18 of them. One resolution registers a protest against, or the orders of the Government compulsorily requiring

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

Panchayat and Taluk Boards to switch on radios to Trivandrum and Calicut stations. Those are also the hardships in the matter of education and other fields. They have become orphans childern having no parents. They do not get the educational facilities they require in their State and this State cannot given them any facilities. Hon'ble Sri Doddmeti is helpless and he realises it. But he realises it only in the case of Kasargode, that is the Kannada areas, and he is blind to the Marathi areas. His standards are different for Marathi and Kannada people.

The two reports of the Four-man Committee have also expressly stated that the hardships of the Kannad and Marathi groups. The best way to remove disabilities, the hardships and the sufferings is by readjusting the boundaries, to allow the Marathi people to go to Maharashtra and bring in Kannada people outside the State to this State.

What was the basis for the demand of Samyukta Karnataka. Linguistic homegenity was the first basis. Secondly, it was a patent argument that the Kannadigas were in a minority everywhere, in Madras, in Hyderabad and in Bombay. They suffered on account of their being a minority. I would like to refer here to the speech of our Hon'ble Chief Minister, Mr. Nijalingappa, when he was a Member of the Parliament in 1955. In his speech on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, he, who was the sponsor and leader of Karnataka people in the Lok Sabha said: "We are a minority in Bombay, we are a minority in Hyderabad, we are a small minority in Madras..So far as democracy is what it is, minorities stand to suffer. It is for that reason that our demand has been insistent." Now he is denying the same to us. I request him that the same principle should be applied to us. The same thing which he demanded then should be applied now. We are a negligible, ineffective minority in the State of Mysore residing in Marathi area.

Similarly, I would quote a detailed statement made by the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee and the Karnatak Ekikaran Samithi in its publication in Hubli in 1948. The Chairman of the Committee was Sri R. R. Diwakar. In the statement it was stated: "It is not possible for a provincial Government to give adequate importance to language, which is spoken by a small minority of its population. The efficiency of administration is bound to suffer and the people speaking minority language are the worst sufferers." There is also a publication of the United Karnatak Committee dating as far back as 1928. While putting forth the demand for Samyukta Karnataka that publication clearly stated "Kannadigas claim whatever is their own and they are ready to concede the same to others." What they have said in the past, they have forgotten now.

SRI A. J. DODDAMETI.—No. We have not forgotten.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—They have not forgotten. They do not want to adhere to it.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Yes, they do not want to adhere to what they said in the past. It was on the basis of being a minority that the Kannadigas demanded an United Karnatak and now they are denying the same to us. We say that we are an insignificant infective minority in Mysore and let us go to our own linguistic group, to the group which is homogeneous to us.

Sri V. M. DEO (Gubbi).—The Brahmin, non-Brahmin question is virulent there. Why go there ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Mr. Deo's position is like that of a man having jaundice in his eyes. He sees yellow everywhere because it is there in his own eyes.

Sir, the most important argument put forth by the sponsors of the Samyukta Karnatak was the will of the people. That was their strong basis for the demand of Karnataka. The same basis is being denied to us. We are about 5 to 7 lakhs in the borders. The Marathi people have expressly, clearly, unequivocally and unambigously demonstrated their wishes to be integrated with Maharashtra in so many elections to the Assembly, the Taluk Boards, Panchayats, Municipalities not once, twice but several times, they have made known their wishes. During the last eight years in all the elections that were held in our area the people have clearly expressed their wishes, to go to Maharashtra and not to stay in Mysore.

11-00 A.M.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Minister for Housing, Transport and Development).—I want to know from the Hon'ble Member whether it is possible to have any province in India consisting of 90 per cent linguistic majority ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Linguistic minorities are bound to be there. Our case is not like that. We are not pockets ; we are part and parcel of Maharashtra. Even a glance at the map will show that. Ours is a compact and contiguous area. They should go to Maharashtra. That is our argument. I would like the Hon'ble Minister to know that we are not a small minority or slight majority in our areas. In the areas we claim, we are 70 per cent. We are speaking of the whole area and not an isolated town or village.

I would come to the stand and arguments put forth by the Mysore Government.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—The time given to the Hon'ble Member is over.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—May I know how much time the Hon'ble Member requires ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—So far as the present resolution under consideration is concerned, I think I have expressed my desire and wish that we expect answer from the Chief Minister. Since he is not well today, this

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

resolution may be held over to the next non-official day. In the meantime if other resolutions fixed for today are to be taken up, we have least objection for that. As Sri B. R. Sunthankar is one of the leading persons so far as Maharashtra boundary is concerned, he is giving his own version regarding his own area. My resolution is not restricted to Maharashtra. It is for unification of all the Kannada areas. So, Mr. Sunthankar's contentions are a corrollary to my resolution. So he may be given sufficient time to express his views. If Sri Dodmeti and others want to express their views, they may also be given sufficient time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has already taken 40 minutes. In another 5 minutes' time he may kindly conclude.

SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, I was referring to the stand taken by the Mysore Government. Let me examine their various arguments. Their first argument which is very patent is that there should be minor adjustments—a few villages here and there. They are making a distinction between major and minor problems. This idea of minor adjustment, they have borrowed from the speech of late Sri G. B. Pant, because he had in his speeches in the Loka Sabha referred to minor problems. I would like to place before the House an extract from the speech of the late Sri G. B. Pant. While replying to the debate on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission in the Lok Sabha he made clear what he meant by the term "minor". He said : "I am not going to say any thing about minor questions—I say, minor in the sense that they are relatively confined to border areas and do not suggest a complete merger of one State in the other or complete reformation of any particular State." So, it is clear from the statement that when he said "minor" he meant only border areas. He made it explicit whenever he said minor it was confined to the border areas and the major was "merger of one State in the other or complete reformation of any particular State". So, I do not understand why so much capital is made of the word minor. If there has to be adjustment it should be a wholesale adjustment and not confined a few villages here and there.

Similarly again this Government has stated ten miles belt on either side should be taken for demarcation. I do not understand how this "10 miles belt", comes in. It is quite arbitrary. What is the basis for this 10 miles belt ? What is the principle ? This is arbitrary. Everybody knows that such arbitrary readjustments are sure to aggravate the situation. What about the rest of the areas ? Suppose 10 miles belt is taken, there are bound to remain certain areas outside the belt which speak that language. What about them ? That will not solve the problem. Such arbitrary solutions will aggravate the situation. It is said there should be *ad hoc* settlement. That will not solve the problem. *Ad hoc* settlements do not solve problem in a democracy.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—According to the Hon'ble Member's argument he says if 10 miles belt is put, it becomes arbitrary. If 20 miles belt

is put, again it is arbitrary. That is to say, according their view-point, a solution would be whatever area they want to be transferred to Maharashtra from Mysore would not be arbitrary. Supposing for arguments sake it is conceded, what guarantee can he give that there will not be another set of people not raising such issues. Anything becomes arbitrary in the eyes of somebody or the other. Somewhere we have to draw a line.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The question of 10 or 15 miles belt does not arise because my wording is clear—contiguity, village as a unit, majority of the language of people and the people must be desirous of joining. If the argument of the Hon'ble Minister is taken into consideration, what about the Sholapur District? Two or three taluks have to be included in Mysore. If 10 or 15 miles boundary is taken all that will remain as a dead letter. So, argument to my resolution to have any fixed boundary is not correct.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am sorry that the Hon'ble Minister has not carefully read the resolution. We have stated clearly the principles, the basis and readjustment that should take place. We know that the pockets will remain. We do not want any arbitrary principles. We do not want pockets to be tossed from one District to another.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—What is the remedy in your view?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—That is why such arbitrary principles won't solve the problem. Let us have some clear and well defined and unidentifying principles. It should be solved on the basis of principles. That is what we have stated in the resolution. *Ad hoc* settlements are not going to solve the problem. They will keep the conflict alive.

Sir, our aim should be to resolve these conflicts regarding border areas once and for all to the satisfaction of the maximum people. That is why we are proposing these definite principles which would try to reduce the conflict to the minimum. By these principles, Sir, linguistic minorities will be reduced to the minimum and these principles will try to achieve the maximum satisfaction to the people. Because, our main attempt in the readjustment should be that the linguistic minorities who are suffering should be reduced to the minimum.

Then, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the amendment of Hon'ble Sri Doddameti. He wants to resolve this by mutual agreement. This mutual agreement in our case has been tried again and again and has failed. There are so many deliberations regarding this issue during the last 8 years. The two Chief Ministers have met several times, but nothing came out of it. It so happens that they will never agree on this border question. Agreement has become impossible. So, let us adopt some principles and demarcate the boundary. As far as contiguity is concerned, I would like to make it clear, that a rea should be continuous and pockets are not to be taken into consideration. I would like to make it clear to the Hon'ble Minister for Labour that we are not demanding any pockets—the area should be contiguous, homogeneous and

(Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

compact. The present re-organisation has created unnecessarily the linguistic minorities on the borders. This principle of linguistic homogeneity was also adopted when Bellary was transferred to Karnatak. Justice Mishra's report is very clear and has adopted the principle of linguistic gravity. On the basis of linguistic gravity, Bellary was transferred to Karnatak. We are asking for the same, nothing else.

VILLAGE AS A UNIT.

That is the proper basis which will satisfactorily solve this border problem. In the first place, village is the irreduceable minimum of social habitation. Village has been the basis of Indian Community since ancient times. Similarly, the village has been the basis for development and planning even at the present time. There is an emphasis on the Panchayat Raj. There is an emphasis at village level for development planning of the country. Sir, village has been the starting point of all the social reconstructions. If we take village as a unit that will be the best way to reduce the minorities to the minimum and in this respect I would like to refer to the report submitted by the representatives of Maharashtra, Sriyuths Pataskar and Bhat. They have tabulated to show what will be the effect if Taluk is taken as a unit, if Circle is taken as a unit and if Village is taken as a unit. And they have clearly shown that by taking all these different units and tabulating the figures of linguistic population, that only by taking village as a unit the linguistic minorities will be reduced to the minimum. That is why we are pressing that village should be taken as a unit.

Sir, I would like to remind the Hon'ble Member Sri Doddameti and others that they claimed certain villages for Samyuktha Karnataka long back from Sathara District having taken village as the basis. They had claimed 50 villages from Satara. Even Sheshadri Fact Finding Committee has accepted village as basis. At so many places, they have stated that the villages should be surveyed and on the basis of villages boundary should be demarcated. Even the Hon'ble Sri S. Nijalingappa, the present Chief Minister, when he was a member of Lok Sabha in 1955, has agreed to the principle of village as a unit. I would like to quote the census figures of 1931. This is regarding the areas which were concerned between Andhra and Karnataka. "The census figures of 1931 could be consulted—villages of the 3 Taluks adjoining Karnatak and adjoining Andhra should go to the respective States according to the linguistic majority". Sir, even the present Chief Minister had agreed to the principle of village as a unit as a basis of demarkation, and now he has been refusing and denying the same principle to us. Without taking village as a unit, how do my friends like Hon'ble Mr. A. J. Doddameti, expect that all the contiguous Kannada areas would come to Mysore-all these areas, Kasargod, South Sholapur, Akkalkot, Jath, Madaksira, Talvadi

firka, etc.? They say, mutual agreement would be necessary. Let me ask what this Government has done during the last eight years regarding the Kannada areas? Have they had any discussion or talks with other States except Maharashtra? Has this Government ever raised this question in Southern Zonal Council. So, mutual agreement would lead nowhere. The wishes of the people which are most important should be supreme and they should be respected. Sir, we have already, so many times, expressed the views of our people, *i.e.*, the people residing in Marathi border areas. They have unequivocally expressed that so many times-I would not again repeat their desire. Our standing challenge is, let this Government take a plebiscite in the border areas on this issue. We are prepared for a plebiscite any time and we will again prove that all the people unequivocally desire that their area should be integrated with Maharashtra. Let the Government accept my challenge. Now, Belgaum City has been the bone of contention. That is the crux of the problem. If the problem of Belgaum City is solved, the whole problem will be solved. All these areas are included in the stomach of Belgaum. Sir, we can substantiate by various authorities the claim of Belgaum to Maharashtra. For want of time, I will only mention some of them. If you take the History of Mysore written by Mr. Wilkes, he has given the boundaries of various linguistic areas. As far Maharashtra, he says that the Southern-most border boundary of Maharashtra is the Sadashivgad District, which means Karwar Town. Karwar was not a District place at that time; it was a very small village in 1810. He had clearly stated that the southern-most boundary is the district of Sadashivgad—even I can refer to the History of Grau Dut the great Historian of the Marathas. He has stated that the border of Marathi-speaking lies in the District of Dharwar. Similarly, even if we refer to encyclopaedia Britannica, the extent of Maharashtra that is given there definitely includes Belgaum in it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಕನ್ನಡದ ಭಾಗಗಳೂ ಇವೆ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—In that case, I may say to my Hon'ble friend, Sri Doddameti that even in Belgaum there were Marathi Rulers and even at the foot of the collosal statue of Gomateshwara at Shravanbelagola there is an inscription in Marathi, one of the first Marathi inscriptions in the nineth or tenth century. We do not want to press it as a proof, but it seems Hon'ble Mr. Doddameti wants such proofs.

About Sholapur, your own Fact Finding Committee has said that Karnataka cannot claim Sholapur. Throughout History, there has been prepondrance of Marathi speakers in Belgaum City, which I have stated so many times in this House. Take the example of Belgaum Municipality. It was established 116 years back. The official language in the Municipality since the very beginning is Marathi. All the records are kept in Marathi and three-fourths of the Councillors, to whatever party they may belong, have always returned Marathi-speakers. Take the case of Schools. Everywhere there is prepondrance of Marathi in all

(Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

fields, in all spheres of life. There are ten Urdu Schools and they are Urdu-Marathi Schools and not Urdu, Kannada Schools.

Then he referred to floating population. He said that there is more floating population of Marathi speakers in Belgaum. The truth is quite contrary. Whatever floating population is there, it belongs to the Kannadigas. Sir, about forty years back, in my childhood, Kannada was rarely heard in Belgaum. There were about 5 to 8 per cent of Kannadigas by 1900, 1905 and 1910. In 1951, they rose to 24 per cent. It is all due to floating population, Sir. Much is made of the statements by some Leaders like N.C. Kelkar and others. Those statements have no bearing on this border problem as has been made clear in the Report of Messers Pataskar and Bhatt. It relates to Belgaum District as a whole and it does not refer to the Belgaum Town as such, and it has absolutely nothing to do with Belgaum City. As regards Belgaum, all the reasons or arguments put-forth in the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission have fallen to the ground. Their first argument was that there is a slight majority of the Marathi people. The majority is not at all slight. The Marathi speakers in Khanapur taluk are 54 per cent, in Belgaum Taluk they are 50 per cent, and what about the percentage of Kannadigas? The percentage of Kannadigas in Khanapur is 34 per cent and in Belgaum Taluk it is 35 per cent. Is that majority slight? That is not a slight majority by any means. The figures of 1951 Census clearly show that this majority is not a slight one; it is a substantial and absolute majority.

Another argument was that Belgaum City was in the transit trade of groundnut and cotton. That was mere ignorance of the States Reorganisation Commission. Belgaum City has nothing to do with the transit trade either of Cotton or ground-nut. The Mysore Government, itself in their memorandum submitted to the Four-man Committee had admitted that this is not true. It had admitted that Belgaum is not a centre of transit trade in ground-nut and cotton. So that argument of the States Reorganisation Commission falls utterly to the ground.

11-30 A.M.

Then, Sir, as I already said, another argument was that the case of Bellary was similar to Belgaum; Bellary was given to Andhra by the commissions; on the same basis Belgaum was given to Karnatak. I have already said that argument also falls to the ground as Bellary has come to Karnatak. So, Belgaum has to go to Maharashtra. That argument of the States Reorganisation Commission utterly falls to ground. They hold no water at all at present. Our request has been that the dispute should be settled once for all. It is no use keeping it lingering. The delay in the solution of this problem is coming in the way of emotional integration and national integration. It is vitiating the relations between the two linguistic groups and between

two States. It is better that in the interest of national integration, emotional integration and in the interest of democracy that this border problem should be solved as early as possible. This Government is playing delaying tactics as I have already said on an earlier occasion. That is why the issue is not being solved.

Sir we have been pleading for the Marathi areas as well as Kannada areas. But this Government has never cared for their own Kannada areas.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Is the Hon'ble Member champion of Kannada people ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Yes.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—We do not accept him.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Who are you to question me ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If you have a right to say so, I have every right to say that you cannot be a champion of Kannada people.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—As a citizen of this State and as a citizen of the Indian Republic, I have got every right to plead for the cause of Kannadigas.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Similarly we have a right to say that you cannot be a champion.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—You have betrayed those Kannadigas, that is why we are forced to take up their cause. What have you done when you were the Chief Minister ?

Sri N. O. SAMAJI.—(In Marathi).

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Here is a map prepared by Bombay Government. It is a public document. This map shows clearly the boundary on both sides in the border areas between Maharashtra and Mysore.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member cannot exhibit it. He can cite that the map contains such and such things.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The map clearly shows what are the Kannada areas that should go to Mysore and what are the Marathi areas that should go to Maharashtra. I would like to ask the Hon'ble Mr. Jatti whether he has prepared such a map in respect of Kasargod, Madakasira and other places.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—What Government should do, we know. We do not want any briefing from the Hon'ble Member.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—We have got every right to point out the failures of the Government. This Government not only betrayed Kannadigas but they have also deceived them. That is why we have to plead their case here. Lastly, I would like to appeal to the Hon'ble Members of this House and to the Government to have a dispassionate consideration of this view, to look to the wishes of the people and grant the wishes of the people and allow the Marathi areas to go back to

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

Maharashtra, and along with that, they should bring back the Kannada areas which are lying outside the State. With these words, I thank you for your indulgence and close my speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Is it the desire of the House that the debate on this resolution should be postponed ?

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The discussion on this resolution is postponed. The next resolution.

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTION

***Re*-Keeping Goa as an independent territory directly under the administration of the Government for ten years and thereafter should be allowed to decide its own future.**

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I move:

"That this Assembly recommends to the State Government to urge upon the Government of India to keep Goa as an independent territory directly under the administration of the Union Government for ten years and thereafter should be allowed to decide its own future."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Resolution moved:

"That this Assembly recommends to the State Government to urge upon the Government of India to keep Goa as an independent territory directly under the administration of the Union Government for ten years and thereafter should be allowed to decide its own future."

Sri B. P. KADAM.—On a point of order. Goa is a State by itself and having its own Government. This is also a State within the Indian Union. How is this Assembly competent to discuss about it ?

Sri N. HUCHMASTHY GOWDA (Chandrashekarpura).—On a point of order. The Hon'ble Member is not in his seat.

(Laughter)

Sri B. P. KADAM.—The Goa Assembly head passed a Resolution and made its wishes clear. In what way this Assembly competent to to fetter down that decision and there by the people of Goa ? Therefore this resolution is a nullity and even if it is tabled, the House is not competent to debate upon it.